

Flaw of Jarzynski's equality when applied to systems with several degrees of freedom.

D.H.E. Gross

Hahn-Meitner Institute and Freie Universität Berlin,
Fachbereich Physik. Glienickerstr. 100; 14109 Berlin, Germany*

Simple example: During the sudden expansion of an isolated ideal gas from a small volume V_0 into a larger one V_1 , the entropy changes by $\Delta S = N \ln(V_1/V_0) = -\beta \Delta F > 0$ but no work W is produced nor absorbed. Consequently, Jarzynski's identity $\langle \exp(-\beta W) \rangle = \exp(-\beta \Delta F)$ is wrong.

In his paper [1] Jarzynski claims the equation (J51)

$$\langle \exp(-\beta W) \rangle = \exp(-\beta \Delta F) \quad (J51) \quad (1)$$

to be valid independently of whether the path from the initial equilibrium state 0 to the final equilibrium state 1 of the system is fast or slow. Here W is the work done on the system ψ in each realization of the process, $\langle \rangle$ means the average over many realizations in contact with an external heat bath θ at temperature $T = 1/\beta$ and $\Delta F = F_1 - F_0$ is the difference of the free energies of the system between its final and initial equilibrium states.

I. TRIVIAL COUNTEREXAMPLE

Already Sung gave a trivial counter example to Jarzynski's identity [2]: An ideal gas of N non-interacting point particles with mass m at an energy E in the volume V has the (Boltzmann) entropy

$$S_{id-gas} = \ln \left\{ \frac{E^{(3N-2)/2} V^N (m)^{3N/2}}{N! \Gamma(3N/2) (2\pi\hbar^2)^{3N/2}} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

consequently, in an iso-energetic sudden expansion it increases by

$$\Delta S = -\beta \Delta F = N \ln(V_1/V_0). \quad (3)$$

Due to the non-existence of any interaction among the particles, the energy of the gas does not change and no work is performed ($W \equiv 0$). Also the (microcanonical) temperature of the gas remains constant. I.e. "equation" (1) is wrong.

Now, this is a microcanonical system and some claim relation (1) cannot be applied to microcanonical ensembles. However, in [1] Jarzynski writes in the discussion: "The derivation explicitly assumes that the reservoir degrees of freedom are initially sampled canonically. The result itself, however, might not depend on this assumption as the derivation suggests. For macroscopic large reservoir, Eq.(J4), in [1], ought to remain valid at least to an excellent approximation, if the initial conditions

are sampled from microcanonical, rather than canonical, distribution." Our example clearly shows it *does* depend on the assumption of a coupling to a canonical bath even though our bath does not matter at all as the process does not produce any heat and is absolutely isoenergetic. Of course, the lack of a heat bath may not be the case Jarzynski considers in this statement about the equivalence. However, as said above in this example the heat bath does not matter at all. Thus I think this is not the reason why his equation does not work here.

So where is the flaw in Jarzynski's "proof"? Jarzynski considers "deterministic" paths $\{z(t), Y(t)\} \equiv \Gamma(t)$ in the $\{6N + \text{bath-dofs.}\}$ -dimensional phase space Ψ of the system ψ with phase space point $z(t)$, and the bath θ with phase space point $Y(t)$ from the initial point Γ_0 , to the final Γ_1 in the finite switching time τ .

Jarzynski writes: " ΔS can be obtained by projecting out from the complete $\Gamma(t)$ the reservoir degrees of freedom (dof); by using the initial and final conditions $\Gamma(0)$ and $\Gamma(\tau)$ to compute the net change ΔQ in the internal energy of the reservoir ΔQ ". Then he uses Clausius formula

$$\Delta S = \Delta S_b = \Delta Q/T, \quad (J2) \quad (4)$$

to relate the energy transfer to the bath to its entropy generation ΔS_b .

He continues by writing: "The ensemble of realizations which we would obtain by endlessly repeating the same process, always initializing ψ in the microstate z_A ; the differences from one realization to the next arises solely from the different *initial* conditions sampled from the reservoir." From this ensemble he constructs the joint probability $P(z_B, \Delta S | z_A)$ to obtain the final microstate of the system z_B under the condition of energy transfer ΔQ , corresponding to the created entropy ΔS , eq.(4), (J2). He states the central result of his paper:

$$\frac{P_+(z_B, +\Delta S | z_A)}{P_-(z_A^*, -\Delta S | z_B^*)} = e^{\Delta S} \quad (J4) \quad (5)$$

where $P_-(z_A^*, -\Delta S | z_B^*)$ is the probability for the time reversed process with the opposite energy transfer $-\Delta Q$ from the point in phase Ψ of ψ with $z_B^* = \{q_B, -p_B\}$ back to the point $z_A^* = \{q_A, -p_A\}$ which is conjugate to the initial point z_A .

Already Clausius [3] used $\Delta S > \Delta Q/T = \Delta S_b$ in his formulation of eq.(4) instead of the equality sign for a

*Electronic address: gross@hmi.de;
URL: <http://www.hmi.de/people/gross/>

“nicht-umkehrbaren” ($\sim$ non-reversible) process. It is quite clear, that a fast process like the one Jarzynski considers is in general a non-reversible fast processes and additional to the entropy generated in the bath there is a considerable *internal* entropy generation $\Delta_i S \propto N$ in the system ψ (in its phase space Ψ) which is uncontrolled by any experimental realization.

Of course Jarzynski insists of heaving the system ψ under absolute control. He assumes that *all* its degrees of freedom $z(t)$ being controlled at any time. For a complex system this is in general impossible. Even for the example of Jarzynski’s figure (1) he needs to control the positions and momenta $z(t)$ of all $N = 6$ particles, i.e. 36 dofs. That is the reason why Clausius uses in equation (4) the $\geq$ sign:

$$\Delta S \geq \Delta S_b = \Delta Q/T, \quad (J2_{corrected}) \quad (6)$$

and speaks of an *uncompensated metamorphosis* $\Delta_i S = \Delta S - \Delta S_b$ in [5]. This is clearly said by Prigogine when he writes for the entropy change of a complex system:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S &= \Delta_i S + \Delta_e S \\ \Delta_i S &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) is the microscopic form of the second law valid for the internal entropy generation. The external entropy change $\Delta_e S$ can be positive, negative, or zero.

Now applied to our situation, there is no heat transfer to a reservoir independently of whether the reservoir is

small or large, i.e. $\Delta Q \equiv 0$. The considered ensemble of trajectories (processes) in the phase space Ψ of the system ψ degenerates to a single deterministic path from z_A to a single final point z_B , even if the final volume has expanded. Evidently the system is not equilibrated in its final state B . The backward process ($z_B^* \rightarrow z_A^*$) has to *start from a non-equilibrium situation* z_B^* . This is in general a *fractal* distribution in the systems phase space Ψ . However, in any real process using a system ψ with several dofs this can usually not be done.

If, however, we allow the system to equilibrate in the new container, in order to test the final free-energy and thus ΔF in eq.(1), as is explicitly assumed in Jarzynski’s chapter V, the entropy of our system ψ would rise by the above $\Delta S = N \ln(V_1/V_0)$ but still no work performed nor heat transferred in clear contradiction to eqs.(4 and J2). Then equations (J51,J60) are violated.

The uncompensated *internal* metamorphosis of a system ψ with several dofs leads to a surplus of internal entropy production over the heat-transfer to the environment divided by the temperature in any non-adiabatic process [5]. This is independent of whether there is a heat bath or not. Then in Jarzynski’s identity (J51) (1) the left side is in general smaller than the right:

$$\langle \exp(-\beta W) \rangle \leq \exp(-\beta \Delta F) \quad (J51_{corrected}) \quad (8)$$

The misuse of Clausius’ definition of entropy (4) is quite common and is further illuminated in [6].

-
- [1] C. Jarzynski. Hamiltonian derivation of a detailed fluctuation theorem. <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/9908286>, (1999).
 - [2] Jaeyoung Sung. Validity condition of the Jarzynski relation for a classical mechanical system. <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/0506214>, (2005).
 - [3] R. Clausius. Über verschiedene für die Anwendung bequeme Formen der Hauptgleichungen der mechanischen Wärmetheorie. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 125:353–400, 1865.
 - [4] P. Glansdorff and I. Prigogine. *Thermodynamic Theory of Structure, Stability and Fluctuations*. John Wiley & Sons, London. 1971
 - [5] R. Clausius. Über eine veränderte Form des zweiten Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheorie. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 93:481–506, 1854.
 - [6] D.H.E. Gross. On the microscopic statistical basis of classical thermodynamics of finite systems. <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/0505242>, (2005).